



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## SELECTION—AN UNNOTICED FUNCTION OF EDUCATION

By Professor W. B. PILLSBURY  
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

**A**LL discussions of education, ancient as well as modern reiterate the belief that education is essentially a process of creating intelligence. They assume that a man with no intelligence, if such existed, might be taken by a suitable educational system or machine and in the course of a few years be given a capacity equal to any, while without it he would remain forever unintelligent. This assumption undoubtedly is in partial harmony with the facts. It, however, neglects one phase of the effect of education that is equally true and perhaps even more important, the fact that education merely selects the men who are capable. Instead of taking all men without respect to intelligence, and making those who go far enough intelligent, it takes all, but rejects the unintelligent and graduates or even trains only the intelligent. The educational system does not create capacity, it merely or largely selects the men of capacity. .

Back of most of the popular and even many of the technical arguments on educational topics is the assumption that all men are equal in ability, and that what differences exist, are the result of training and of chance factors in the environment. Recently evidence has been accumulating that by nature men have all degrees of intelligence. A few with little training accomplish much; many with all the training of which they are capable never rise to mediocrity. As opposed to the popular belief it is our intention to present the thesis that men are as different in intelligence as they are in stature or as in length of life, and see what conclusions follow.

Only within the last two decades, and mainly within the last few years, has it been possible to obtain any direct experimental evidence of the way intelligence is distributed in the general population. With the development of a psychology of mental measurement, and the wide application of the measures, we can begin to discuss the problem with some basis of fact. To silence criticism by granting the lesser claims of critics and insisting only upon what is assured, we may admit that there are many defects in all the measures that have been applied and that many of the advocates of particular methods have claimed too much for them. We have only the vaguest notion what intelligence is. Our measures serve to distinguish only the more marked differences. We still lack any sufficient criterion, aside from

the tests, of what an individual whom we have assigned a position by our measurements will be able to accomplish in any standard practical task. Still they suffice to show what wide gulfs divide the highest from the lowest and even the extremes from the average. We can say in answer to any criticism that psychologists know much more of all this than do the popular writers on educational topics.

In the recent army tests conducted by a number of psychologists and helpers, a million and three quarters men were tested by the same measurements. These were draft men chosen at random, except that the army surgeons were supposed to have eliminated all the mentally defective and inferior. The results of tests were carefully computed and correlated for one hundred thousand men of English names chosen at random from the list. These in turn agreed with and so confirmed the results from other groups similarly treated for preliminary reports. The tests used were also compared with other tests that had been applied to the measuring of a large number of school children, so that indirectly there are a number of cross checks on the method and a possibility of comparing the results obtained with those gained from numbers of school children.

Taken at their face value, the tests give a definite indication of the way the intelligence of the nation is distributed. Even if the tests were sometimes not so very carefully made, as is likely from the number of men who gave them, even though all were thoroughly trained in advance, they still furnish a general idea of the great range of intelligence in the male population. The army tests consisted in part in following directions for simple tasks, perceiving relations, performing simple arithmetical computations, putting words together to form sentences, detecting misstatements, and answering question which measure general information. Altogether an individual might make a score of 212. No one had time and information to answer all. Only 135 was required to attain the highest or A grade. This probably redeemed many of the apparent absurdities of the tests. Some of those, particularly the questions intended to test general information, were of a character that gave no particularly good indication of useful knowledge. With so low a standard, any one should have been able to answer a sufficient number to atone for failure on questions that ought not to have been included in the list.

On the basis of the tests, men were divided into groups that were designated at A, B, C+, C-, D, and E. These were defined in terms of ability to reach certain grades in the school system, partly because that offered a convenient means of labeling, and in part because it corresponded on the whole to the grade the men had actually attained. The A group of five or six per cent. do well in college. The B men are less successful in college but do well in high school. The C+ men complete the high-school course, the C men rarely do. The others

would not be able to go beyond the grades, the E men not beyond the third grade.

One other convenient and frequently used means of defining or describing intelligence should be mentioned, as we shall have occasion to use it. This is Binet's scheme of measuring and grading intelligence in terms of the stage reached by a child at each year of his age. In the measurement of the feeble-minded, he compared the success of the individual to be tested with the success of the children of different ages in the same tests. Thus we may speak of a mental age of seven, ten, or twelve, indicating that the individual, irrespective of his real or chronological age, has the intelligence of a child of seven, ten, or twelve. And the D. group in the army tests might be said to have a mental age of eight, the E, of seven or below. The average mental age of adult whites of English name was a little below thirteen years.

The most plausible interpretation of the results of these tests indicates that on the average the stage in the school system attained by the average individual corresponds roughly with his capacity. It might be argued that the results of the tests were due to the amount of training given in the schools. That this is not the case seems evident from the fact that the tests were chosen so far as possible, with the intention of requiring no knowledge that would not be thrust upon any individual who lived in the average environment. They were planned to measure ability and not knowledge. It is also confirmed by the fact that a few men who had no educational advantages stood among the highest. They were men from isolated communities who had had no chance to attend school, but who would undoubtedly have done good work if they had been given an opportunity. The close agreement with the grade reached in school is, we may believe, due to the fact that most Americans go as far as they can in the school system, so that the amount of education is pretty closely related to the degree of natural intelligence. Had the men who stood first never been inside of a school room, they would have done as well in the tests as they did. Or, to put it less strongly but in a way that is practically the same from our present point of view, having the ability that they had and living in the social environment that they did, they were sure to reach the school grade that they did.

Accepting these results for the sake of argument, we can draw many interesting conclusions concerning economic and political problems, as well as concerning the problems of education with which we are now dealing. If we have a body politic in which only fifteen per cent. of the citizens can be expected to make any important contributions, and possibly not more than half are able to understand clearly the real problems of the state, have we the machinery for selecting the men who are best fitted for the higher grades of work, or are we al-

lowing our best to waste time with unimportant affairs while lesser intelligences are struggling vainly with the great problems.

We may make illuminating comparison with what was probably the most detailed selective system ever applied on a large scale, the scheme put into effect by Suleiman the Magnificent in the sixteenth century when the Turks were at the height of their power. In broad outline this was completely democratic in the process of selection, although put into effect by one of the most thoroughgoing autocrats of history. It will be recalled by readers of Lybyer<sup>1</sup> that officials and soldiers were chosen for the imperial household from among the best children of the Christian population, and were taken to the court and there systematically trained in the line for which they showed the most aptitude. Agents went through the entire realm at regular intervals, examining the boys between ten and twenty and choosing the most intelligent, the strongest and the fairest for school. Slaves in name, in reality they were students and potential rulers. Once entered in the college of pages or in the corresponding school for soldiers, nothing but their own endeavor and own capacity was permitted to decide how far they might rise. They were slaves in status and worked under compulsion. When started on the career, they had no alternative but to do the best in that line. They could not escape if they would, and there was a fair field and no favor, with the possibility of great rewards and high distinction for the few who showed themselves capable. Selection and the strongest possible incentives, all worked together to make the ruling body and the soldiers of the Ottoman Empire the best that could be provided within the limits of the realm.

This was probably superior to any of the other methods employed at that stage of the development of the world's history. It is due to this rigid selection, probably, more than to any other fact that the Turk came near conquering Europe. Certainly the average ability was no higher, if we may judge from the later course of the empire, than in other portions of Europe. The education was rigidly enforced and was intensely practical. But no one could contend that the education developed the ability. Only the pages who were destined for the offices of the household were taught to read and write. These were also trained in the Turkish law, in the religious books, in the literature of Arabia and Persia, with some smattering of history. All were given rigid physical training, were taught a trade useful in war and one that might at need be relied upon for support.

The rigid selection of the physically and intellectually best was the essential factor. There were numerous grades in each service and a student could rise from one to another only as he excelled in

<sup>1</sup>Lybyer, "The Ottoman Empire in the time of Suleiman the Magnificent."

the lower. Advancement through these grades to the highest places was possible in any service. There was no favor, and any man could rise to the highest position, granted only that he had ability. We have good reason to believe that the power of the Turk depended very largely upon this system of selection, not upon education. This selection was not complicated by any favors to sons of powerful men; since only Christians were chosen and they must become followers of Islam when they were inducted, their sons were ineligible to succeed them. Coupled with early selection of the best was full opportunity to attain the position for which the individual's talents fitted him, with rich rewards for the successful ones. Education may have counted for something, but however important the thorough military drill and the vigorous physical exercises, it was hardly suited to work wonders in what we would call intellectual training.

Is there a similar selection working in a democracy such as we have in America? There is not and probably could not be developed a system that would select youths for training of different forms; that could say to one boy, "You have promise and will be given the training and opportunity of trying for high office," to another "You have only manual skill and shall be trained to a skilled trade, with only sufficient literary education to enable you to read and be a good citizen," and to a third, "You have neither mental ability nor manual skill and can only be an unskilled laborer," and so on through the list, prescribing to each the occupation he shall follow, based upon test or study of his capabilities.

On the other hand, many of the agencies that we regard as having other functions do really serve to sort and sift, and many of the advantages that come from these agencies are due more to the selection they work than to the training they give. The official agencies such as are provided by the civil-service examinations, act too late and are too superficial in operation to have any marked influence. They select on the basis of knowledge rather than ability and are so carelessly administered that they do little more than take the place of the politician in choosing by chance more than by favor. Their only positive advantage is to break up political machines and to prevent the obviously and grossly unfitted from securing positions.

More important and more long continued in its action is the system of education. Although the educational system is supposed to make intelligence rather than to select it, it is certain that selection is a most important feature, even if no attempt were made, as might with considerable plausibility be done, to argue that the primary, if not the exclusive, function is to discover rather than to create, or even to train, intelligence. In any state with a compulsory school system, all grades of intelligence are fed in at the bottom. The worst of them repeat the lower grades, and even with the kind-hearted or

indifferent teacher of the least modern school, or of the most modern who works under the training-school dogma that the child should determine the character and amount of instruction, the inferior are excluded after three or four grades. In the more modern schools, tests select these incompetents earlier and they are given training adapted to their capabilities and are not expected or permitted to follow the regular curriculum. They graduate into the ranks of unskilled labor and can never expect to do more than earn a living. Society can ask only that they develop habits that will permit them to live in society without becoming criminals or paupers.

The higher capacities are sorted roughly by the regular school work. Those who find study too hard at any stage drop out and go to work, and when freed from the necessity of attendance at fourteen, only those of more than average capacity are left in the schools. Only the chosen upper 25 per cent. or less can reach the high school or go far into it, and about twenty per cent. do. Of these about half are eliminated before the high school years are completed. A still smaller percentage reaches the universities or colleges of the country. The educational system may be regarded as primarily a sieve for the separation of the competent from the incompetent. It would be very interesting to know if it is effective in this respect, and whether it alone suffices to put the administrative offices into the hands of the best.

Common observation indicates that there are other forces at work in the selection of individuals for the higher educational institutions than the mere ability to pass the work. The cynic can see evidence of the operation of at least two other forces. One is the wealth and advice of the parents, and the other, the social esteem in which education is held by the different grades of society. Certainly the son of a wealthy man is much more likely to go to an institution of higher learning than is the son of a pauper. Even in the least expensive of universities some reserve money is required. At the best, only the youth of exceptional energy as well as exceptional ability will be able to make his way through college without some backing or accumulated family capital. If he could take care of himself, it not infrequently happens that he will have the family in part dependent upon him, and so part of the selection is at best determined by the family finances rather than by sheer ability.

One can argue, and with plausibility, by the support of what statistics are available, that, in the long run and on the average, the men whose fathers are at least moderately well off are more likely to possess a higher degree of intelligence than are those who come from homes of poverty. Accidents such as the death of a parent may well account for families of good ability being without resources. At present, too, the men who go into the professions of teaching and preaching, no matter of how much ability or how successful, seem

fairly certain to be unable to educate their children from their earnings. But, on the whole, while selection on the basis of wealth would tend to eliminate some who might succeed, it would not prevent the college men from being a chosen group.

The number of people who go to college would on the whole correspond fairly closely with the number who were capable of profiting by a college education. On a rough calculation, assuming on the basis of the army tests that 10 per cent. are capable of profiting fully by college education and that one twelfth of the population is between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two, we would have less than a million who are capable of doing college work. Of these, approximately a fifth are actually in college or have been in and withdrawn. If no more than four fifths of those capable of profiting by training are lost, we may not be able to boast of perfection, but may be reasonably satisfied, considering the defects in our knowledge of most of the factors that must be considered. This selection may be regarded as fairly effective in spite of the limitations imposed by the varying wealth of the population and the dependence, in some degree, of possibilities of education upon wealth—in spite, too, of the limitations imposed by the uneven development of the schools, the discouragement that comes from bad temper and incapacity on the part of badly selected or poorly trained teachers, and all the other circumstances which may be regarded as chance.

Running parallel with this is selection of the opposite type. In many classes in America, there is a constant temptation to enter occupations that give immediate monetary returns. Many boys in the teens try business and trades for a time in vacations. Many, if not a majority, of the college men in America pay their way, in part at least, by odd jobs during vacations, or in the odd hours of term time. This brings a constant temptation to the more successful to continue permanently in what was accepted as a means to an end. Emphasizing this aspect, one might regard the men chosen for education as the men rejected by the skilled trades. It is undoubtedly true in an industrial community of the middle class that many of the boys try the trades and those who succeed best remain, while the others go on with their studies. In some cases physical handicaps, like the loss of a leg or an arm, will force a man to become a member of the learned professions. Usually, however, the professions are regarded as more honorable and desirable in every way, and this social prestige counterbalances immediate present success. The men of the better mechanical ability, or the men of better address and natural skill in dealing with people, are often trapped by too great initial success, and with the slight training in fundamentals which they have obtained at that time can go no farther than the business into which they have entered will permit. Those who do not chance upon a position early



in which they can succeed without training go back into school and continue to the end. It is of course extravagant to say that the professions are filled with the individuals who are rejected by the trades. On the average the selection is the other way round, but, that selection by rejection from the more immediately practical occupations exists, can not be denied.

On the whole, however, there is from this lot rejected by industry another sifting by the need for success in school, which leaves only those who are superior in intelligence, as well as those not particularly skillful mechanically in the list of college students. Then, too, the wealthier men are not tempted by industry although they may be by business and "society" or by mere desire for pleasure without responsibility. These are drawn to educational institutions, first, by the social prestige of the college, and, second, by its reputation as a place for a good time and as a desirable place to make acquaintances. The university or college may do these men no good, but at least their presence insures that the college shall contain a fair sampling of the men of higher intelligence chosen even from the most wealthy classes, from those whose families have been most successful in business, and who, if we accept the two assumptions that the wealthy are the intelligent and that intelligence is inherited, should average among the most intelligent members of the population. From this group come probably a fair number of the professional men, and especially a large proportion of the men who are to conduct the big businesses, or the not inconsiderable number who have not been selected by actual success in the business world itself.

How great is the part of the university in the selection of the men for the prominent places in the general community is evident from the statistics printed in the 1910-1911 edition of "Who's Who in America." This shows that fifty-eight per cent. of the men listed were college graduates, if we include the military men who are graduates of their technical schools, and that seventy-one per cent. had attended college or university for a longer or shorter time. Only ten per cent. had nothing more than a common-school education, and less than one per cent. asserted that they were self-educated. Whether selection or education is more important, the effect is wrought through the educational system. Of course it might be asserted that the 17,000 men in "Who's Who" indicate only a small fraction of the men who are filling important positions and that an undue proportion of these were in literary and academic pursuits, just as on our assumption it represents only a fraction of the men who are capable of attaining prominence. It is fair to say, however, that the proportion of college to non-college men who are in similar positions who are not included in that list will probably be approximately the same as in the list. Our first assumption that twenty per cent. of the men selected for the

highest positions are chosen through the educational system seems rather an under than an over estimate.

The other forms of selection are through success in some particular occupation. In every large business there is a constant stream of men who rise from the ranks, and a large proportion of the successful men, who acquire wealth and position and thus become prominent in society or in politics, are chosen in this way. These are made up, in part, of men of high intelligence who for some reason dropped from school early. Many undoubtedly have capacities that would not have led to academic success but are valuable in business. How many of the latter type there are, and what constitutes the means of selection or the measure of ability is, most probably, value to the business in the opinion of the immediate superior. In many departments we find in the amount of business secured or in the actual accomplishment in the individual's own business objective measures of ability. All of these embody tests of energy, of push, and of social capacities that are not involved in the university work or are not important in the same degree. We know only that intelligence is required for a high degree of business success, but courage and energy may compensate in some degree as they cannot in the higher school work.

What relation there may be between success of this type and what we call intelligence as measured by scholastic work, is not definitely known. Probably successful business men are a mixture of those who succeed because of good intelligence, mixed with a certain amount of persistence and fighting qualities, of those who have considerable fighting ability and less intelligence, and of those who know how to get on by taking their opinions and aims and methods from successful men about them. One of the most successful of modern manufacturers showed in a recent court examination that he would not be able to pass at all one of the tests most relied upon in the best known series of mental tests, that of making definitions of abstract terms. Of course, the tests are not so well established that we can regard that as evidence of his defective intelligence rather than of the unreliability of the test. Certainly, if we are to prove that certain of these men lack intelligence, a large part of the population would regard it as a proof that intelligence is an undesirable characteristic.

Very interesting would it be to raise the question whether intelligence is closely correlated with wealth. On the whole, there can be no doubt that the two are connected. We find an occasional exception in individuals of markedly low intelligence who have accumulated considerable wealth, and we have the testimony of Charles Francis Adams that the men of wealth are on the whole stupid. As statistical evidence is the fact that several surveys of the well-to-do

neighborhoods indicate that the children there are mentally a year older than are the children of the slums of the same chronological age. This of course, is a comparison between the poor and those of average wealth, but has a bearing upon our problem in so far as it indicates that the well-to-do are more intelligent than the poverty stricken. On the whole it would seem that while a modicum of intelligence is necessary for great wealth, other factors are important. Some of these are beneficial to society, others not. Among the most important of these qualities are initiative, persistence, social address, acceptance of conventional ideals, and in many cases an emotional defect or defect of imagination that impairs sympathy for the victims in those instances in which wealth is won at the expense of others. Many intelligent men think that acquiring wealth is not worth the effort required and prefer to apply their energy in other directions; many lack the immediate opportunity, and still others are disturbed by the thought of the men who may suffer in the process. This last attitude is well illustrated by a student who explained his failure to succeed on a summer canvassing tour for an article of luxury, by his inability to talk enthusiastically when he knew that the people to whom he was trying to sell really needed their money for the necessities of life. Men selected for great wealth are above the average in intelligence, but wealth is not a direct measure of intelligence.

We can picture the educational system as having a very important function as a selecting agency, a means of separating the men of best intelligence from the deficient and mediocre. All are poured into the system at the bottom; the incapable are soon rejected or drop out after repeating various grades and pass into the ranks of unskilled labor. The really defective go at once to the homes for dependents and to penal institutions. We are frequently inclined to forget that almost half of our criminals and most of our paupers are mentally deficient. A teacher of an ungraded room in a western city school was twitted by the county attorney with graduating her pupils from the school to the juvenile court. The more intelligent who are to be clerical workers pass into the high school; the most intelligent enter the universities, whence they are selected for the professions. Up to this point the sifting process works with an accuracy that approximates twenty per cent. At least one fifth of those best fitted intellectually find their way to college. Of the best who are shifted into practical work before this stage is reached, some work their way to ruling positions in business and industry, or develop through irregular means into professional men. Others become politicians, to which career neither law nor custom sets definite requirements for admission.

After the university man has been selected by the educational system for his intelligence, coupled to a certain degree with the per-

sistence and other volitional characteristics needed to make his intelligence effective, he must again be passed upon by society at large for his social and more human characteristics. More than a few well-trained physicians fail to obtain patients because they can not inspire confidence in, or arouse antagonism from those whom they would cure, and great success at the bar or as an engineer is only for the relatively few who are selected for social and personal qualities from those passed as competent by the schools. This makes necessary the training of a much larger number of men for each profession than is really needed in the profession, and implies much waste of time and of emotion on the part of the men who are rejected at this final stage. Not all of the training is lost, for it may be applied in other ways. At least no way to prevent it is at present available.

In emphasizing the selective phase of the effect of education, we have no desire to minimize its importance in training or in supplying needed knowledge. Undoubtedly there are ascribed to training many of the advantages that are really the effect of selection, but were the most brilliant men prevented from acquiring knowledge, they would have relatively little capacity. Were the most intelligent man to begin without a knowledge of what had been acquired by earlier generations, he could go no farther than did Thales or Socrates, who would certainly rank well with the highest intellects of this or any other time. Some of this knowledge could be and is picked up from books, more from the activities of everyday life in an environment made possible by and altogether dependent upon the instruments devised by predecessors and contemporaries. Complete mastery is certainly much easier to obtain through, if it does not actually require, systematic training that can best be had in a regular educational institution. Knowledge of methods, of the best usage in every field, comes more surely and easily through instruction of the formal type. Contact with others who are doing the same work is not a small factor in real training. We are not in a position to deny that there may be some general effect of training that may make the individual more effective everywhere because of the habits and particularly the ideals that have been acquired in one restricted field. Our only thesis is that much of what we are accustomed to ascribe to the improvement of the individual through education is due merely to the selection through the educational system of those who were fitted by original endowment to accomplish the tasks we would set them. It should be insisted that this is no mean function. To select the men who are capable of training, even to select the men who are capable of the highest accomplishment, even if their capacity was not increased in the process, is a function of the highest importance.

There can be no doubt that the fact that selection is confused with

training constitutes an important fallacy in most educational arguments. All advocates or apologists for educational systems or methods are wont to point to the product as a justification of their existence. The argument is advanced for the Chinese as for the medieval, as well as for the tripos at Cambridge and the honor course at Oxford, to come no nearer home. Each could point to the fact that most of the men who won distinction were products of the school system. We find and are willing to accept the statement that the most successful Indian civil servants are men who stood well in the mathematical tripos, and the implication is that they are excellent civil servants because they studied mathematics thoroughly and successfully. The conclusion is usually drawn that all civil servants should have an equally thorough mathematical training in order to create or develop the power of governing. We are all willing to accept this conclusion. Less evident to the occidental seems the corresponding argument of the Chinaman that true greatness can be the product only of spending years in committing to memory the works of Confucius, although as arguments both are on a par. Each neglects the factor of selection. The mathematical tripos selects men of the highest capacity, perhaps of the highest capacity peculiarly fitted to the exercise of the functions of a civil servant. The Chinese system also selects superior men for the governmental positions. There is nothing in the argument and little in the inherent probabilities of the case to convince one that could these men have been selected in any other way without a knowledge of mathematics, they would not have been just as effective. This confusion of selection with training is what saves ineffective systems of education. Whether they improve the individual who goes through them or not, they do sort the capable from the incapable, and training is given the credit that belongs to selection.

It might be questioned whether it is worth while to spend so much time in selecting through the slow process of the school system if selection is so large a function of that system. One might urge that we develop a set of tests similar to the army tests and apply them to the youth when they present themselves at the kindergarten and then assign them to the form of instruction that they would be capable of or that would prepare them for the function in life that is suited to their abilities. Did we have tests that were accurate, and were there possibility of revising the rating to make allowance for change with increasing maturity, a good case could be made for the early selection. In fact it is already being introduced in varying degrees in several cities. Most now have some degree of elimination of the most feebly endowed from the regular classes, with special more suitable training that shall give the minimum of academic and a maximum of practical work. A few are attempting to make other classifications on the basis

of intelligence as determined by test. Both have proven satisfactory so far as developed and more use could be made of them did we have the proper machinery.

There are grave objections, however, to a complete control of selection by one individual or agency, even assuming an entirely adequate system of tests and perfect competence in the administration of them. As it is, tests have, at most, a general significance. They suffice to recognize large differences fairly accurately, but at the border line where small differences are significant they would work many injustices. The effect upon the individual who was misplaced downward would be disheartening, while for the men who were encouraged to go on for work beyond their powers the system would have no advantages over the present method. The present general belief in equality of capacity with the correlate of equal opportunity provides an incentive to endeavor that cannot be overestimated. Were one to be told authoritatively that one had no chance to be more than a day laborer and would be permitted to learn no more than was necessary for that, and was by law prevented from attempting to fit one's self for anything better, most of the joy of living would be eliminated. It would be much worse than to be told that one belonged to an inferior social order. The present system gives occasional reminders that one is not of great ability, but there is always chance of mistake, and the general belief in equality serves as a consolation as well as a constant spur to endeavor.

As compared with the organization of the conquering Turk, our present system works fairly well and through purely democratic means. The schools gather at least a fifth of the capable men, and feed probably half of the men of the very highest capacity into the universities. There they become mutually acquainted, are prepared to be useful in the professions and in controlling the thought and action of the masses through the press and through the educational system and by books. In some degree, although much less than could be wished, they supply the actual rulers of the state. They are impelled to strive to enter through the social prestige that attaches to being a student and to the professions themselves and are held to their tasks by hopes of the rewards that the professions offer. Distribution to the tasks for which they are fitted is not so accurate and certain as in the Ottoman regime, but here, too, there is approximation to adequacy in selection, with gradual advancement of the men who are best qualified. While this is not the only agency that acts in selecting and selection is not the only function of the school, it is sufficiently important to justify the existence of the educational system did that have no other warrant. It also must be said that it is the factor that conceals as well as atones for the faults in the functions that we ordinarily associate with education.